DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 431 067 UD 032 978

AUTHOR	Czerwinski, Harvey; Loundmon, Queen Brame
TITLE	Evaluation of the Professional Services Agreement between the Detroit Public Schools and Sylvan Learning Systems, Inc.
INSTITUTION	Detroit Public Schools, MI. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Testing.
PUB DATE	1999-05-10
NOTE	75p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; Low Achievement; Parent Attitudes; Parents; *Performance Contracts; Principals; *Private Sector; Questionnaires; Reading Achievement; *Reading Instruction; Surveys; Tables (Data); Teacher Attitudes; Teachers; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Detroit Public Schools MI; Metropolitan Achievement Tests; Michigan Educational Assessment Program; *Sylvan Learning Systems

ABSTRACT

In 1997, the Detroit Public Schools Board of Education established an agreement with Sylvan Learning Systems, Inc. to enable Sylvan to provide supplementary reading instruction to selected students in 10 elementary, middle, and high schools. An evaluation was conducted to determine the extent to which Sylvan met its goals. Data indicate that Sylvan did not meet its first goal of providing at least 55 hours of instruction to 1,458 students, and it was not effective in accomplishing its second goal of increasing school MEAP and MAT7 scores. When Sylvan schools were compared with control schools, there were no significant differences in grade 4 and grade 7 reading MEAP scores. Teachers (n=106) had mixed reactions to the Sylvan program, but parents liked the program, and principals (n=10) expressed an interest in continuing Sylvan services in their buildings. It was recommended that Sylvan services be continued, with the program adjusted to pay for the number of hours that actually could be used. Improved cooperation between classroom teachers and Sylvan staff was also recommended. Five appendixes contain MEAP and MAT7 data and the parent, teacher, and principals surveys. (Contains 76 tables.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Moore

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 431 067

EVALUATION OF

THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

BETWEEN

THE DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

AND

SYLVAN LEARNING SYSTEMS, INC.

HARVEY CZERWINSKI AND QUEEN BRAME LOUNDMON, EVALUATORS

OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND ASSESSMENT
DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MAY 10, 1999

UD 032 978

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PROGRAM FACTS	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
SYLVAN LEARNING SYSTEMS, INC., 1997-98 PROGRAM EVALUATION	1
Introduction	1
Background	2
Guarantees	4
Purpose of Evaluation	4
Evaluation Questions	4
Methodology	5
Data Analysis	5
GENERAL FINDINGS	6
Cost of Program	6
Participants	6
CONTRACT SPECIFIC FINDINGS	12
MEAP	12
MAT	20
Principal Interviews	24
Teacher Surveys	28
Parent Phone Interviews	34
CONCLUSIONS	38
RECOMMENDATIONS	39
Hours of Service	39
Guarantees	39
MEAP	39
MAT	40
Teacher In-Service Training	40
Parent Involvement/Cooperation	40
APPENDICES	41

PROGRAM FACTS

Name of Program	:	Sylvan Learning Systems, Inc.
Funding Year	:	1997-98
Purpose of Program	:	To address the needs of the lower-achieving students by providing supplementary reading instruction, for a period of three years, to selected students in ten Title I schools.
Features of Program	:	The major components of the program are equipment and materials, diagnostic testing, student instruction, Sylvan personnel, staff development for school personnel, parental involvement, and reports.
Funding Source	:	Title I
Funding Level	:	$2,435,000
Number and Level of Participants	:	2,319
Number and Level of Schools in Program	:	7 elementary schools; 2 middle schools; 1 middle/high school with grades 7-12
Staffing Pattern	:	Two teachers and one director for each school provided by Sylvan
Instructional Time	:	Regular hours five and one-half hours per day – with after school tutoring for some schools
Equipment and Materials	:	All instructional materials, supplies and equipment (computers on a three-to-one ratio) in each learning center provided by Sylvan
First Year of Funding	:	1997-98
Names of Schools	:	Brewer, Burbank, Burroughs, Campbell, Cooper, Douglass Goodale, MAAT Imhotep, Priest, and Stark School of Technology

1997-98 Evaluation of Sylvan Learning Services, Inc.

Executive Summary

Program Description

On August 20, 1997, Detroit Public Schools Board of Education established an agreement with Sylvan Learning Systems, Inc., to enable this group to provide supplementary reading instruction, for a period of three years, to selected students in ten schools that included elementary, middle, and high school levels. Of the schools receiving Sylvan services, there are seven elementary - Brewer, Campbell, Cooper, Goodale, MAAT Imhotep, Priest, and Stark School of Technology; two middle schools – Burbank and Burroughs; and one middle/high school (7-12) -Frederick Douglass Academy. The Sylvan program agreement specified the provision of reading instruction to 1,458 students annually (150 students for 7 schools; 133 for 1 school; and 175 for 1 school) identified as having the greatest need for this type of instruction.

Sylvan, in its original agreement, made two guarantees to the Detroit Public Schools Board of Education. **MEAP Guarantee:** The schools will increase the satisfactory level on the MEAP over the previous year by 5 percentage points provided 85% of the grade appropriate students attending the Sylvan Center attend a minimum of 55 hours of instruction in one subject. **MAT7 Guarantee:** Of the students who receive 55 hours of instruction, 90% will achieve a gain of three Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points on the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7).

If the guarantee is not met (those attending the required number of hours), the school will receive 12 hours of instruction for students not meeting the guarantee at no charge, or the school may pool the guarantee hours and assign them to other students.

The Sylvan program consists of seven components, 1) the provision of technology, 2) diagnostic testing of students, 3) student instruction in reading, 4) specially trained personnel, 5) staff development for school personnel, 6) the involvement of parents, and 7) regular reports of student progress.

Cost Impact

The contract between the Detroit Public Schools Board of Education and Sylvan Learning Services, Inc., calls for three years of instructional service (116,456 hours/year 1 including summer school hours; 103,176 hours/year 2, and 103,176 hours/year 3) for 1,903 students the first year and 1,433 each subsequent year. Total cost for the three years is projected to be $6,799,500. Funding (100%) is provided by Title I grant funds.

Goals of the Report

The purpose of this evaluation report is to determine the degree to which the Sylvan staff has attained, during the

first year implementation of its program, the following expected outcomes:

- Sylvan's provision of contracted hours of instruction: at least 55 instructional hours for students by the date on which students began MEAP testing, January 26, 1998;

- Sylvan's provision of contracted hours of instruction: at least 55 instructional hours for a total of 1347 students by the date on which students began MAT7 testing, March 23, 1998;

- Sylvan's guarantee of 5 percentage points increase at the satisfactory level on the MEAP provided 85% of the grade appropriate students attend the Sylvan Center a minimum of 55 hours of instruction; and

- Sylvan's guarantee of at least three NCE gains on the MAT7 for 90% of the students who attend the Center for a minimum of 55 instructional hours.

The evaluation also identifies how students who attended the Sylvan Center for the first year performed when compared to students who did not attend the Sylvan Center.

Findings

The first year of the evaluation of Sylvan Learning Program was a truncated year and may reflect restricted results relative to the student gains and, therefore, should be interpreted with caution.

- As a result of student transfers, a total of 1431 students received some level of instructional services from the Sylvan Learning Centers (SLC) through January 23, 1998. Of this number, 24 received the contractual 55 hours of instruction, which demonstrates that the target was not met.

- Sylvan schools were expected to increase the satisfactory category on the MEAP by 5 percentage points. Since 4 of 7 elementary schools (57%) had an increase of a minimum of 5 percentage points on Grade 4 MEAP Reading, and neither of the two middle schools had an increase of a minimum of 5 percentage points on Grade 7 MEAP Reading, the target was not met.

- There is no significant difference in Grade 4 MEAP Reading scores between the Sylvan schools and a control group of schools.

- There is no significant difference in Grade 7 MEAP Reading scores between the Sylvan schools and a control group of schools.

  Each of the 10 Sylvan schools had students with both 3+ NCE gains and 55+ hours of instruction. The percent of students with 3+ NCE gains and 55+ hours ranged from 82 out of 83 students (98.8%) at MAAT Elementary to 2 out of 77 students (2.6%) at Burbank Middle. The total students with 3+ NCE gains and 55+ hours of instruction are 149 out of 574 (26.0%). As 90% of the students were expected to make the three NCE gains on the MAT7, the target was not met.

- All principals indicated an interest in continuing the Sylvan Learning Center in their buildings.
- Teachers' reactions to the Sylvan Learning Program were mixed.
- Parents liked the program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. As a result of the positive feedback received from school principals, teachers, and parents, continue Sylvan Learning Centers in the ten schools that currently have contracted for services by Sylvan.
2. Convene an ad hoc committee consisting of representatives from Research and Evaluation, the legal department, and school principals to review any future agreements with Sylvan Learning Systems, Inc.
3. Prepare recommendations regarding the following issues:
    - Adjusting the number of hours by reducing the amount initially purchased according to hours actually needed and the number that can be used.
    - Amending the contract to allow schools to purchase additional hours, if needed, at a comparable rate of pay.
    - Focusing selection of students according to those students who will be administered the MEAP test, insuring that the Contractor is held to the guarantees for overall school gains.
    - Developing and nurturing a collaborative relationship with the Sylvan staff and teachers to insure that in-services are scheduled and all teachers are aware of them.
    - Fostering parent involvement, participation, and cooperation and developing a collaborative relationship with parents to insure that they are made to feel welcome in the schools.

THE DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS DETROIT BOARD OF EDUCATION
RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND ASSESSMENT

Sylvan Learning Systems, Inc.
1997-98 Program Evaluation

This report presents findings related to the evaluation of the first year implementation of the Sylvan program at ten Title I Detroit Public Schools that included elementary, middle, and high school levels. The first year of the evaluation of Sylvan is a truncated year and may reflect restricted results relative to student gains and other findings and, therefore, should be interpreted with caution. The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the degree to which Sylvan has attained its goals of a) providing 55 instructional hours for a minimum of 1458 students, b) increasing by 5 percentage points, the satisfactory category on the MEAP Reading Test for the ten schools with the Sylvan centers, and 3) increasing NCE scores in the MAT7 Reading Comprehension by three points for 90% of the students. The evaluation also provides a comparison of gains for the schools served by Sylvan during the year of service relative to MEAP Reading scores and a comparison of gains for students served by Sylvan during the year of service for the MAT7 Reading. Findings indicate the following: 1) Sylvan did not meet the first goal of 1458 students served for 55 or more instructional hours; 2) it was not effective in accomplishing its second goal for the ten schools of 5 percentage points increase; and 3) it did not meet its goal for 90% of the 1458 students, as per its agreement with the Detroit Public Schools Board of Education. When compared with similar schools, there is no significant difference in Grade 4 MEAP Reading scores between the Sylvan school and a control group of schools and there is no significant difference in Grade 7 MEAP Reading scores between the Sylvan schools and a control group of schools.

Introduction

Experts agree that students who fail to learn to read adequately by third grade are at- risk of becoming high school dropouts, teenage delinquents, and victims of unwanted pregnancies along with many other social and economic problems. Many interventions for improved instruction are implemented at the elementary school level. However, it is crucial that attention also be given to the continuous development of reading skills of students during the middle and high school years.

Braddock and McPartland contend that, at the middle school level, "course failures and grade retention can also be prevented without lowering standards by giving special assistance to students who have the least preparation or who are having specific learning difficulties in a major subject" (1993, 148-149). They reported the results of an NELSS 88 survey of principals from over 1,000 schools which indicate that "students who have fallen behind in math or reading clearly benefit by attending a school with extensive remedial programs" (1993, 149).

Among the most effective "ways of providing 'extra doses' for instruction were (1) offering an extra period in the subject during the regular school day schedule in lieu of an elective and (2) summer school classes" (1993, 149-150).

In order to deal effectively with the problems of inadequate academic skills and preparation, school districts across the nation have responded to the educational needs of at-risk students by contracting out some of its educational services to private organizations. One such organization is Sylvan Learning Systems, Inc. Sylvan started a partnership with the Baltimore City Public Schools in 1993 to serve students at six elementary public schools. Since its beginning, the privatized model that Sylvan offers has expanded its services to more than 60 public schools at more than eight other school districts: Dorchester and Talbot Counties in Maryland; Chicago, IL; Washington, D.C.; St. Paul, MN; Pasadena, TX; Broward County, FL; and Detroit, MI. Reports released during the past few years have reviewed achievement test results for the elementary and middle school students who participated in Sylvan programs and who met the attendance requirement.

According to Mike Bowler of the Baltimore Sun, Baltimore City Public Schools reported reading gains on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (the test used in the Maryland school performance program) of 1.5 normal curve equivalents in reading and 14 in mathematics. Likewise, Pasadena Independent School District reported average NCE gains of between 8 and 13 on the California Achievement Test as well as substantial gains on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills, a criterion-referenced test (Gallegos). Similar results have been reported by The School Board of Broward County, Florida (Blasik) for the 1995-96 school year. One hundred forty-three students tested in Reading Comprehension on the reading subtest of the California Achievement Test (CAT), gained an average 6.2 NCEs in Reading Comprehension. Of the same group, 141 students tested on the Stanford Achievement (SAT8) achieved a 6.5 NCE gain in Reading Comprehension. When Broward compared the gains for Sylvan students to a control group, the study found that average scores indicated that students in the Sylvan program outperformed by two NCE points similar students receiving other Title I services. At the end of the first year of Sylvan services in Detroit Public Schools, no significant gains have been made in the satisfactory category of MEAP Reading. Results of NCE gains on the MAT7 are inconclusive at this time.

Background

On August 20, 1997, the Detroit Public Schools Board of Education established an agreement with Sylvan Learning Systems, Inc. to enable this group to provide supplementary reading instruction, for a period of three years, to selected students in ten Title I schools that included elementary, middle, and high school levels. Of the schools receiving Sylvan services, there are seven elementary – Brewer, Campbell, Cooper, Goodale, MAAT Imhotep, Priest, and Stark School of Technology; two middle schools – Burbank and Burroughs; and one

middle/high school (7-12) – Frederick Douglass Academy. The Sylvan program agreement specified the provision of reading instruction to 1458 students annually (150 students for 7 schools; one school with 133 students; one school with 175 students, and one school with 100 students) identified as having the greatest need for this type of instruction. The provider utilizes diagnostic testing, a structured reading program with an individualized educational plan for each student, a three-to-one ratio of direct instruction, and technology that is tied to the curriculum. The seven specific components of the Sylvan program include:

1. ***Equipment and Materials.*** Sylvan staff are to equip each school with all instructional materials, supplies, and equipment necessary to implement the Sylvan program. Sylvan staff have furnished sufficient computers in each learning center to ensure that a three-to-one ratio of students to computers is maintained.

2. ***Diagnostic Testing.*** Prior to placement in the Sylvan program, each student is to be assessed program staff using the Reading subtest of the California Achievement Test (R-CAT). Sylvan also administered the Sylvan Learning Center Reading Diagnostic Test (SLCRDT). These diagnostic tests are used to determine areas of strength and weaknesses for each student and to develop an individualized prescription instructional plan. The SLCRDT is also used during the year to chart progress.

3. ***Student Instruction.*** Sylvan staff are to provide a minimum of 116,454 (including summer school) hours of instruction for the ten participating schools for the first year and a minimum of 103,176 hours of in instruction for the ten participating schools for each of the second year and the third year. Each student in the Sylvan program is prescribed an individualized instructional plan. This plan is provided through direct instruction with a student-teacher ratio of no more than three-to-one.

4. ***Sylvan Personnel.*** The company states that they use qualified instructors who hold a duly issued teacher's certificate from a state teacher-licensing agency provide direct instruction.

5. ***Staff Development for School Personnel.*** Sylvan staff are to provide inservice staff development training sessions, at least once a semester, for each school's teachers and administrators. The purpose of the training sessions is to familiarize school personnel with the Sylvan program instructional methods and to offer suggestions for modification of the learning environment in the program and in the regular classroom.

6. ***Parental Involvement.*** The Sylvan staff are to host two informational meetings per year for parents of students who receive Sylvan services. Regular parent conferences are scheduled every other month. in addition to at least two learning seminars during the school year to provide parents with

ideas for involvement in their children's learning.

7. ***Reports.*** Sylvan staff are to prepare and distribute weekly attendance reports, monthly summary reports, and a cumulative report at the end of the school year.

Guarantees

Sylvan, in its original agreement with the Detroit Public Schools Board of Education, made two guarantees.

MEAP Guarantee: The schools will increase the satisfactory level on the MEAP over the previous year by 5 percentage points provided 85% of the grade appropriate students attending the Sylvan Center attend a minimum of 55 hours of instruction in one subject.

MAT7 Guarantee: Ninety percent of the students will show a minimum of three NCE gains on the MAT7 over the previous year provided 85% of the grade appropriate students attending the Sylvan Center attend a minimum of 55 hours of instruction in one subject.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation report is to determine the degree to which the Sylvan staff has attained, during the first year implementation of its program, the following expected outcomes:

- Sylvan's provision of contracted hours of instruction: at least 55 instructional hours for students by the date on which students began MEAP testing, January 26, 1998,
- Sylvan's guarantee of 5 percentage points increase at the satisfactory level on the MEAP provided 85% of the grade appropriate students attend the Sylvan Center a minimum of 55 hours of instruction,
- Sylvan's provision of contracted hours of instruction: at least 55 instructional hours for a total of 1347 students by the date on which students began MAT7 testing, March 23, 1998; and
- Sylvan's guarantee of at least 3 NCE gains on the MAT7 for 90% of the students who attend the Center for a minimum of 55 instructional hours.

The evaluation also identifies how students who attended the Sylvan Center for the first year performed when compared to students who did not attend the Sylvan Center.

Evaluation Questions

The following questions will be answered in this evaluation:

1. How successful were Sylvan staff in meeting the target of at least 55 instructional hours for the students served by the date on which students began MEAP testing, January 26, 1998? Since this was a truncated year, schools may not have started the program at the beginning to the year, and would therefore not have the 55 hours of instruction.

2. Did students who participated in the Sylvan program achieve higher gains in MEAP satisfactory compared to other students who did not participate?

3. Did the schools participating in the Sylvan program increase the satisfactory level by 5 percentage points on the MEAP test?

4. How successful were Sylvan staff in meeting the target of at least 55 instructional hours the students served by the date on which students began MAT7 testing March 23, 1998.

5. Did students who participated in the Sylvan program achieve NCE gains of at least 3 NCE units on the MAT7?

The evaluation also compares the achievement of students who attended the Sylvan Center for the first year to a control group of students who did not attend the Sylvan Center.

6. Did students who participated in the Sylvan program achieve higher gains in MAT7 Reading NCE scores compared with other students who did not participate?

Parent, teacher, and principal attitudes toward the Sylvan Learning Centers were also assessed.

7. What were the parents' attitudes toward the SLC?

8. What were the teachers' attitudes toward the SLC?

9. What were the principals' attitudes toward the SLC?

Methodology

Data Collection

In order to determine the degree to which the Sylvan staff has attained, during the first year of implementation of its program, the provisions of the MEAP and MAT7 guarantees, attendance records for each of the schools were collected prior to the administration of each test. Results of both the 1997-98 MEAP and 1997-98 MAT7 were obtained for participants in the Sylvan program as well as for the control groups. Additionaliy, demographic data for the program participants and the comparison groups were obtained from district records.

Principal interviews were conducted for each participating school and results were compiled. Teacher surveys were administered to the teaching staff at each school and results were compiled. A parent telephone survey was conducted and results were compiled.

Data Analyses

Tables are used to present demographic characteristics of the participants reported by number and percent for each category of interest. Student achievement in reading has been summarized through descriptive statistics for both MEAP and MAT7.

Survey responses were summarized and frequency distributions prepared.

The findings are divided into two sections: General Findings and Contract Specific Findings.

General Findings

Cost of the Program

Table 1 lists the cost, number of students, and number of instructional hours contracted to receive Sylvan services by school. Funding was provided by Title I.

The total cost of funding 10 Sylvan Learning Centers for the 1997-98 school year was $2,435,000. Of this figure, $335,000 was allocated for 16,080 summer hours and the remaining $1,875,000 was to cover the cost of 89,976 hours to be used during the regular school year. A total of 1,150 students were contracted to receive services during the regular school year. A breakdown of the total cost contracted for a total of 106,056 hours of service for 1,150 students computes to an hourly rate of $20.83 per student. Of the total number of students to receive services, 470 were scheduled to begin during the summer school program.

Table 1
Cost, Number of Students, and Number of Instructional Hours Contracted for Service by School

School	Cost	Number of Students Contracted to Serve	Number of Hours of Service Contracted
Brewer Elementary	$300,000	150	**14,000**
Burbank Middle School	$250,000	150	**12,000**
Burroughs Middle School	$225,000	150	**10,800**
Campbell Elementary	$200,000	133	**9,576**
Cooper Elementary	$225,000	150	**10,800**
Frederick Douglass Academy	$160,000	100	**7,680**
Goodale Elementary	$300,000	150	**14,400**
MAAT Imhotep	$275,000	175	**13,200**
Priest Elementary	$225,000	150	**10,800**
Stark School of Technology	$275,000	150	**13,200**
Total	**$2,435,000**	**1,458**	**116,456**

Participants

Participant Selection

Principals were asked to describe their student selection process for the Sylvan Center. Eight out of ten principals referenced the need to prepare students for the MEAP as the criterion for selection. Fourth grade students targeted to participate in the 1998 administration of MEAP and third graders who were expected to take the 1999 test were selected to participate in the program. Similarly, at the middle school level,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

academically challenged sixth and seventh graders were selected to receive Sylvan service.

For the year, the SLC provided a total of 83,638 student instructional contact hours. This represents 71.8% of the total hours purchased with the first year contracts. This leaves 32,908 hours of service that were paid for but were not received in the 1997-98 school year. Sylvan indicated that they planned to deliver unused hours during the summer of 1998.

Grade levels of the students who participated in the Sylvan Learning Centers ranged from Kindergarten to Grade 12. The majority of the students who received instructional hours were of African-American decent with a very small number of Whites and Hispanics. Most of the students were male. Tables 2 to 7 present a representation of the costs, number of students served, number of students with 55+ hours of instruction, number of hours contracted, and number of hours of instruction received by school.

Table 2
Cost of Sylvan Program with
Number of Students Served, Number of Students with 55+ Hours of Instruction, Number of Hours Contracted on 8/20/97, and the Number of Hours Received Through June 15, 1998
By School

School	Cost	Number of Students Served	Number of Students With 55+ Hours	Number of Hours Contracted On 8/20/97	Number Of Hours Received Through June 15, 1998
Brewer	$300,000	208	88	14,000	**9,871**
Burbank	$250,000	351	4	12,000	**7,992**
Burroughs	$225,000	190	74	10,800	**8,949**
Campbell	$200,000	198	97	9,576	**8,627**
Cooper	$225,000	292	47	10,800	**8,884**
Douglass	$160,000	147	30	7,680	**4,999**
Goodale	$300,000	270	6	14,400	**8,095**
MAAT	$275,000	283	82	13,200	**10,411**
Priest	$225,000	168	94	10,800	**8,424**
Stark	$275,000	212	18	13,200	**7,387**
Total	**$2,435,000**	**2319**	**540**	**116,456**	**83,638**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade Level. The grade distribution is displayed in Table 3. The majority of students serviced in the centers were third graders (n=798, 34.8%). A total of 61 seventh grade students (2.6%) received instruction in the centers, while 603 (26.0%) fourth grade students received instruction.

On average, each child attending SLC received 36.1 hours of instruction (See Table 4). Fourth grade students received an average of 41.1 hours of instruction, while seventh graders received 13.5 hours. A total of 540 students received 55 hours or more of instruction as indicated in Table 5.

Of the 603 fourth graders attending a SLC, 185 students (30.7%) had a minimum of 55 hours of instruction. Two out of the 61 seventh grade students (3.2%) received a minimum of 55 hours of instruction. Because less than 85% of the grade appropriate students attending the Sylvan centers attended a minimum of 55 hours of instruction, the Sylvan MEAP Guarantee is null and void. Because this aspect of the contract makes it difficult to hold the company to its performance guarantee, the district has engaged the company in renegotiations of the contractual language

Table 3
Number of Students Attending the
Sylvan Learning Centers by Grade
Through June 15, 1998

School	Grade													Group Total
	Kdg	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Brewer	6			34	113	54	1							208
Burbank							303	48						351
Burroughs							189		1					190
Campbell				86	59	53								198
Cooper		26	18	138	104	6								292
Douglass								13	26	48	22	24	14	147
Goodale				159	110	1								270
MAAT	4			222	57									283
Priest				31	76	61								168
Stark				128	84									212
Group Total	**10**	**26**	**18**	**798**	**603**	**175**	**493**	**61**	**27**	**48**	**22**	**24**	**14**	**2,319**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4
Average Number of Hours of Instruction
per Student Attending the Sylvan
Through June 15, 1998

School	Grade													Group
	Kdg	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	Average
Brewer	29.3			60.4	43.4	49.8	49.0							47.5
Burbank								25.5	5.5					22.8
Burroughs								46.9		13.0				31.0
Campbell														36.8
Cooper		13.7	18.4	25.3	43.5	35.3								34.8
Douglass								43.2	40.0	36.8	29.5	35.2	28.2	43.6
Goodale				32.0	27.0	37.0								34.0
MAAT	4.0			34.2	49.0									50.1
Priest				48.0	51.0	50.1								47.3
Stark				30.6	41.3									30.5
Group Average	**8.4**	**13.7**	**18.4**	**35.8**	**41.1**	**42.5**	**33.7**	**13.5**	**43.3**	**36.8**	**29.5**	**35.2**	**28.2**	**36.1**

Table 5
Number of Students with a Minimum of 55 Hours of Instruction
In the Sylvan Learning Centers
Through June 15, 1998

School	Grade										Group
	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	Total
Brewer	23	44	21								88
Burbank				4							4
Burroughs				73		1					74
Campbell	60	26	11								97
Cooper	13	34									47
Douglass					2	11	11	2	2	2	30
Goodale	6										6
MAAT	57	25									82
Priest	14	46	34								94
Stark	8	10									18
Group Total	**181**	**185**	**66**	**77**	**2**	**12**	**11**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**540**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The number of students serviced, the mean hours of service, the standard deviation, the minimum, maximum and the total student instructional contact hours provided are listed by school in Table 6. A grade level distribution of instructional hours provided is listed by school in Table 7.

Table 6

Number of Hours of Instruction in the Sylvan Learning Centers by School Through June 15, 1998

School	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Sum
Brewer	208	47.46	24.39	4	110	**9871**
Burbank	351	22.77	12.14	4	60	**7992**
Burroughs	190	47.35	25.52	4	130	**8494**
Campbell	198	43.57	27.14	4	102	**8627**
Cooper	292	30.53	18.93	4	71	**8884**
Douglass	147	34.01	22.73	1	104	**4999**
Goodale	270	29.98	9.50	4	67	**8095**
MAAT	283	33.79	26.57	4	103	**10411**
Priest	168	50.14	20.09	1	82	**8424**
Stark	212	34.84	17.03	6	76	**7386**
Total	**2,319**	**36.10**	**22.40**	**1**	**130**	**83,638**

Table 7

Number of Student Contact Hours provided by the Sylvan Learning Centers by Grade Through June 15, 1998

School	Grade													Group Total
	Kdg	10	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Brewer	176			2053	4905	2688	49							**9871**
Burbank							7730	262						**7992**
Burroughs							8819		130					**8949**
Campbell				4941	2248	1438								**8627**
Cooper-		356	331	3465	4250	212								**8884**
Douglass								561	1039	1754	650	590	395	**5009**
Goodale				5090	2968	37								**8095**
MAAT	16			7601	2794									**10411**
Priest							8819		130					**8424**
Stark				3915	3471									**7386**
Group Total	**192**	**356**	**331**	**28554**	**24785**	**7431**	**16598**	**823**	**1169**	**1754**	**650**	**590**	**395**	**83638**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ethnicity. As illustrated in Table 8, the majority of students served were African Americans 1974 (85.1%), followed by White 69 (3.0%), Hispanic18 (0.8%), Asian 16 (0.7%), and Native American/Eskimo 8 (0.3%).

Table 8
Number and Percents of Students in the Sylvan Learning Centers with 55+ Hours of Instruction by Ethnicity Through June 15, 1998

Ethnicity	Number in SLC	Percent	Number with 55+ Hours	Percent	Number with 3+NCE and 55+ Hours	Percent
Native American/Eskimo	8	0.3	2	0.4	1	0.7
Asian	16	0.7	4	0.7		
African American	1974	85.1	461	85.4	133	89.3
Hispanic	18	0.8	13	2.4	2	1.3
White	69	3.0	26	4.8	8	5.4
Missing	234	10.1	34	6.3	5	3.4
Total	**2319**	**100.0**	**540**	**100.0**	**149**	**100.0**

Gender. A larger number of males 1248 (53%) than females 1071 (46.2%) were serviced by Sylvan for the 1997-98 school year as reflected in Table 9. Likewise, a larger number of males 299 (55.4%) than females 241 (44.6%) received 55+ hours of instruction. Of the students who gained 3+ NCE units and received 55+ hours of instruction, there were 80 males (53.7%) compared to 69 females (46.3%).

Table 9
Number and Percents of Students in the Sylvan Learning Centers with 55+ Hours of Instruction by Gender Through June 15, 1998

Gender	Number In SLC	Percent	Number With 55+ Hours	Percent	Number with 3+NCE And 55+ Hours	Percent
Female	1071	46.2	241	44.6	69	46.3
Male	1248	53.8	299	54.4	80	53.7
Total	**2319**	**100.0**	**540**	**100.0**	**149**	**100.0**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Students with Special Needs: Table 10 presents the proportion of special needs students who received 55 or more hours of Sylvan instruction. Of the 20 students who received Sylvan services, 6 (30%) received 55+ hours of instruction while 4 (20%) achieved a gain of 3+NCE units and received 55+ hours of Sylvan instruction. Burroughs had the largest number of students enrolled in the Sylvan program with 5 (25%) followed by Cooper with 4 (20%), Brewer and Campbell both with 3 (15%), Douglass and MAAT with 2 (10%), and Burbank with 1 (5%).

Contract Specific Findings

MEAP

1. **How successful were Sylvan staff in meeting the target of at least 55 instructional hours for the students served by the date on which students began MEAP testing January 26, 1998?**

Table 10
Number and Percents of Special Education Students in the Sylvan Learning Centers with 55+ Hours of Instruction by School

School	Number in SLC	Percent	Number with 55+ Hours	Percent	Number with 3+NCE and 55+ Hours	Percent
Brewer	3	15.0	1	16.7	1	25.0
Burbank	1	5.0			1	25.0
Burroughs	5	25.0	1	16.7	1	25.0
Campbell	3	15.0	1	16.7	1	25.0
Cooper	4	20.0	2	33.3		
Douglass	2	10.0				
Goodale						
MAAT	2	10.0	1	16.7		
Priest						
Stark						
Total	**20**	**100.0**	**6**	**100.1**	**4**	**100.0**

Note: Due to rounding, total percent may equal more than 100.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The grade distribution is displayed in Table 11. Of the 1,431 students receiving Sylvan instruction, fifty-one students are no longer attending a Detroit Public School. The majority of students serviced in the centers were fourth graders (n=584, 40.8%). A total of 137 seventh grade students (9.6%) received instruction in the centers.

On average, each child attending SLC received 24.6 hours of instruction (See Table 12). Fourth grade students received an average of 28.9 hours of instruction, while seventh graders received 30.2 hours. A total of 21 grade 4 students received 55 hours or more of instruction as indicated in Table 13. Of the 584 fourth graders attending a SLC, 21 students (3.6%) had a minimum of 55 hours of instruction prior to the MEAP. One out of the 137 seventh grade students (0.7%) received a minimum of 55 hours of instruction. Because less than 85% of the grade appropriate students attending the Sylvan centers attended a minimum of 55 hours of instruction, the Sylvan MEAP Guarantee is null and void.

Table 11

Number of Students Attending the Sylvan Learning Centers by Grade Through January 23, 1998

School	Left DPS	Grade												Group Total
		02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	K	
Brewer	3	2	23	82	48									158
Burbank	7					6	128							141
Burroughs	4					155	2	1						162
Campbell			74	38	19									131
Cooper	11	4	32	97	2								1	147
Douglass	8			1			7	8	31	10	14	18		97
Goodale	2		30	103	1									136
MAAT	2		30	113										145
Priest	11		24	68	56									159
Stark	3		70	82										155
Group Total	**51**	**6**	**283**	**584**	**126**	**161**	**137**	**9**	**31**	**10**	**14**	**18**	**1**	**1431**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 12
Average Number of Hours of Instruction
per Student Attending the Sylvan Learning Center by Grade
Through January 23, 1998

School	Left DPS	Grade												Group Average
		02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	K	
Brewer	17.7	20.5	24.0	29.5	24.9									27.0
Burbank	18.9					11.7	30.7							29.3
Burroughs	12.3					14.1	16.5	44.0						14.3
Campbell			29.1	24.1	18.8									26.2
Cooper	15.8	4.0	16.8	28.3	4.5								17.0	23.8
Douglass	8.8			19.0			24.0	30.1	25.6	21.8	25.4	25.1		23.9
Goodale	22.5		22.1	26.6	23.0									25.5
MAAT	23.5		15.5	42.3										36.5
Priest	17.5		20.5	22.0	22.9									21.8
Stark	15.7		17.8	21.5										19.7
Group Average	**15.9**	**9.5**	**21.6**	**28.9**	**22.7**	**14.0**	**30.2**	**31.7**	**25.6**	**21.8**	**25.4**	**25.1**	**17.0**	**24.6**

Table 13

Number of Students with a Minimum of 55 Hours of Instruction
In the Sylvan Learning Centers
Through January 23, 1998

School	Left DPS	Grade												Group Total
		02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	K	
Brewer														
Burbank							1							1
Burroughs														
Campbell														
Cooper														
Douglass									1	1				2
Goodale														
MAAT				21										21
Priest														
Stark														
Group Total				**21**			**1**		**1**	**1**				**24**

The number of students serviced, the mean hours of service, the standard deviation, the minimum, maximum and the total student instructional contact hours provided are listed by school in Table 14. Prior to the administration of the MEAP, the SLC provided a total of 35,227 student instructional contact hours (see Table 15). This represents 33.2% of the total hours purchased with the first year contracts. This is less than 65% of the contracted total of 116,456 hours paid for by the schools.

As of January 23, 1998, school was in its second semester with only 86

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

instructional days remaining. This means that schools were in session for over one-half of the school year but less than one-third of the contracted hours of Sylvan service was used. The late start-up at several of the sites is partially responsible.

Table 14

Number of Hours of Instruction in the Sylvan Learning Centers from the Start of Program to June 15, 1998

School	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Sum
Brewer	158	26.97	6.90	13	46	4261
Burbank	141	29.32	11.17	3	55	4134
Burroughs	162	14.28	6.12	4	44	2314
Campbell	131	26.17	7.50	5	46	3428
Cooper	147	23.78	10.56	4	40	3495
Douglass	97	23.90	13.39	1	65	2318
Goodale	136	25.49	4.64	13	37	3466
MAAT	145	36.51	16.14	4	68	5294
Priest	159	21.78	6.73	1	31	3463
Stark	155	19.70	6.77	5	42	3054
Total	**1431**	**24.62**	**11.02**	**53**	**68**	**35227**

Table 15

Number of Student Contact Hours provided by the Sylvan Learning Centers by Grade to June 15, 1998

School	Left DPS	Grade												Group Total
		02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	K	
Brewer	53	41	551	2422	1194									4261
Burbank	132					70	3932							4134
Burroughs	49					2188	33	44						2314
Campbell			2154	916	358									3428
Cooper	174	16	538	2741	9								17	3495
Douglass	70			19			168	241	795	218	355	452		2318
Goodale	45		662	2736	23									3466
MAAT	47		466	4781										5294
Priest	192		493	1497	1281									3463
Stark	47		1245	1762										3054
Group Total	**809**	**57**	**6109**	**16874**	**2865**	**2258**	**4133**	**285**	**795**	**218**	**355**	**452**	**17**	**35227**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. **Did students who participated in Sylvan program achieve higher gains in MEAP satisfactory compared to other students who did not participate?**

Although not included in the Sylvan guarantee, part of the evaluation design requires that the schools with a SLC be compared to a control group of schools that have not purchased the SLC program. A comparison group of schools was selected based upon the school membership, the Title I poverty index, the percent of students in the "Satisfactory" category on the 1996-97 MEAP reading test, the percent of students in the "Low" category on the 1996-97 MEAP reading test, and geographic location. The tables displaying these variables are in the Appendix. t-tests were performed to verify that no significant differences exist between these two groups based upon the selection criteria.

Tables 16a and 16b compare the SLC schools with the control group on the percent of students in the "Satisfactory" category on the Grade 4 MEAP for the 1996-97 and 1997-98 School years. Four of the seven SLC schools (57.1%) had increases in the percent of students in the "Satisfactory" category between the 1996-97 school year and the 1997-98 school year compared with five of the seven control schools (71.4%). On average the SLC schools made a gain of 8.1 percentage points. This compares with an average 5.0 percentage point gain by the control group. A t-test was conducted which indicated that there is no significant difference between the SLC schools and the control schools in the percent of students in the "Satisfactory" category on the MEAP at the fourth grade (See Appendix).

3. **Did the schools participating in the Sylvan program increase the satisfactory level by 5 percentage points on the MEAP test?**

Four of the seven elementary schools (57%) had an increase of a minimum of 5 percentage points on Grade 4 MEAP Reading. None of the middle schools had an increase of a minimum of 5 percentage points on Grade 7 MEAP Reading. Since Sylvan schools were expected to increase the satisfactory category on the MEAP by 5 percentage points, the results demonstrate that the target was not met. (See Tables 16a, 16b, 17a, and 17b) However, it must be remembered that the minimum number of students receiving 55 hours or more of Sylvan instruction prior to the MEAP test was not met. Again, the fact that year 1 of the program was a truncated year is partially responsible for this lack of instructional time.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 16a
Percent Satisfactory on the Grade 4 MEAP Reading Test
1996-97 Compared to 1997-98
Schools with Sylvan Learning Centers

School	Area	School Code	1996-97 MEAP Grade 4 Reading		1999-98 MEAP Grade 4 Reading		Gain/Loss
			Number Tested	Percent Satisfactory	Number Tested	Percent Satisfactory	
Brewer	F	769	110	47.3	123	32.5	-14.8
Campbell	A	078	54	50.0	52	32.7	-17.3
Cooper	E	071	83	18.1	85	25.9	7.8
Goodale	F	136	175	22.3	120	65.0	42.7
MAAT	F	309	136	66.9	119	77.3	10.4
Priest	A	296	131	16.8	120	12.5	-4.3
Stark	F	331	115	15.7	97	29.9	14.2
Total			**804**		**716**		
Weighted Average			**115**	**32.9**	**102**	**40.9**	**8.1**

Table 16b
Percent Satisfactory on the Grade 4 MEAP Reading Test
1996-97 Compared to 1997-98 Control Schools

School	Area	School Code	1996-97 MEAP Grade 4 Reading		1997-98 MEAP Grade 4 Reading		Gain/Loss
			Number Tested	Percent Satisfactory	Number Tested	Percent Satisfactory	
Carleton	F	055	157	51.0	168	43.5	-7.5
Carstens	F	056	98	14.3	76	11.8	-2.5
Clark	F	063	145	21.4	126	23.0	1.6
Holmes AL	E	165	86	22.1	88	44.3	22.2
Neinas	A	270	47	53.2	75	62.7	9.5
Stellwagen	F	333	136	42.6	102	50.0	7.4
White	E	376	157	11.5	164	17.7	6.2
Total			**826**		**799**		
Weighted Average			**118**	**29.7**	**114**	**34.7**	**5.0**

Tables 17a and 17b compare the SLC schools with the control group on the percent of students in the "Satisfactory" category on the Grade 7 MEAP for the 1996-97 and 1997-98 school years. One school in each group had an increase in the percent of students in the "Satisfactory" category between the 1996-97 school year and the 1997-98 school year. On average, the SLC schools decreased by 5.9 percentage points. This compares with a 6.7 percentage point decrease by the control group. A t-test was conducted which indicated that there is no significant difference between the SLC schools and the control schools in the percent of students in the "Satisfactory" category on the MEAP at the seventh grade (See Appendix).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 17a

Percent Satisfactory on the Grade 7 MEAP Reading Test
1996-97 Compared to 1997-98
Schools with Sylvan Learning Centers

School	Area	School Code	1996-97 MEAP Grade 7 Reading		1997-98 MEAP Grade 7 Reading		Gain/Loss
			Number Tested	Percent Satisfactory	Number Tested	Percent Satisfactory	
Burbank	F	405	187	25.1	204	11.8	-13.3
Burroughs	E	406	170	10.6	264	14.0	3.4
Douglass	A	617	10	20.0	25	0.0	-20.0
Total			367		493		
Weighted Average			**122**	**18.2**	**164**	**12.4**	**-5.9**

Table 17b

Percent Satisfactory on the Grade 7 MEAP Reading Test
1996-97 Compared to 1997-98
Control Schools

School	Area	School Code	1996-97 MEAP Grade 7 Reading		1997-98 MEAP Grade 7 Reading		Gain/Loss
			Number Tested	Percent Satisfactory	Number Tested	Percent Satisfactory	
Cleveland	E	414	275	17.5	227	15.4	-2.1
Foch	F	438	189	23.8	193	8.8	-15.0
McMillan	A	465	19	21.1	20	35.0	13.9
Total			483		440		
Weighted Average			**161**	**20.1**	**147**	**13.4**	**-6.7**

Because the SLC focuses on students most in need, the percent of students in the "Low" category of achievement of the MEAP was also examined. Tables 18a and 18b list the Grade 4 comparison. Three of the seven SLC schools (42.9%) had decreases in the percent of students in the "Low" category between the 1996-97 school year and the 1997-98 school year, compared with four of the seven control schools (57.1%). On average the SLC schools decreased by 1.9 percentage points. This compares with a 1.0 percentage point decrease by the control group. A t-test was conducted which indicated that there is no significant difference between the SLC schools and the control schools in the percent of students in the "Low" category on the MEAP at the fourth grade (See Appendix).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 18a

Percent Low on the Grade 4 MEAP Reading Test
1996-97 Compared to 1997-98
Schools with Sylvan Learning Centers

School	Area	School Code	1996-97 MEAP Grade 4 Reading		1997-98 MEAP Grade 4 Reading		Gain/Loss
			Number Tested	Percent Low	Number Tested	Percent Low	
Brewer	F	769	110	25.5	123	37.4	11.9
Campbell	A	078	54	16.7	52	30.8	14.1
Cooper	E	071	83	37.3	85	43.5	6.2
Goodale	F	136	175	41.7	120	12.5	-29.2
MAAT	F	309	136	8.1	119	1.7	-6.4
Priest	A	296	131	50.4	120	60.8	10.4
Stark	F	331	115	51.3	97	45.4	-5.9
Total			**804**		**716**		
Weighted Average			**115**	**34.5**	**102**	**32.5**	**-1.9**

Table 18b

Percent Low on the Grade 4 MEAP Reading Test
1996-97 Compared to 1997-98 Control Schools

School	Area	School Code	1996-97 MEAP Grade 4 Reading		1997-98 MEAP Grade 4 Reading		Gain/Loss
			Number Tested	Percent Low	Number Tested	Percent Low	
Carleton	F	055	157	20.4	168	25.6	5.2
Carstens	F	056	98	54.1	76	61.8	7.7
Clark	F	063	145	41.4	126	46.8	5.4
Holmes AL	E	165	86	45.3	88	27.3	-18.0
Neinas	A	270	47	36.2	75	28.0	-8.2
Stellwagen	F	333	136	27.9	102	25.5	-2.4
White	E	376	157	61.1	164	58.5	-2.6
Total			**826**		**799**		
Weighted Average			**118**	**40.5**	**114**	**39.5**	**-1.0**

Tables 19a and 19b list the Grade 7 comparison. One of the three SLC schools (33.3 %) had decreases in the percent of students in the "Low" category between the 1996-97 school year and the 1997-98 school year, compared with two of the three control schools (66.6%). On average, the SLC schools increased by 10.3 percentage points. This compares with a 12.4 percentage point decrease by the control group. A t-test was conducted which indicated that there is no significant difference between the SLC schools and the control schools in the percent of students in the "Low" category on the MEAP at the seventh grade (See Appendix).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 19a

Percent Low on the Grade 7 MAEP Reading Test
1996-97 Compared to 1997-98
Schools with Sylvan Learning Centers

School	Area	School Code	1996-97 MEAP Grade 7 Reading		1997-98 MEAP Grade 7 Reading		Gain/Loss
			Number Tested	Percent Low	Number Tested	Percent Low	
Burbank	F	405	187	30.5	204	57.4	26.9
Burroughs	E	406	170	58.2	264	49.6	-8.6
Douglass	A	617	10	50.0	25	76.0	26.0
Total			**367**		**493**		
Weighted Average			**122**	**43.9**	**164**	**54.2**	**10.3**

Table19b

Percent Low on the Grade 7 MEAP Reading Test
1996-97 Compared to 1997-98 Control Schools

School	Area	School Code	1996-97 MEAP Grade 7 Reading		1997-98 MEAP Grade 7 Reading		Gain/Loss
			Number Tested	Percent Low	Number Tested	Percent Low	
Cleveland	E	414	275	56.4	227	32.2	-24.2
Foch	F	438	189	52.4	193	52.3	-0.1
McMillan	A	465	19	42.1	20	50.0	7.9
Total			**483**		**440**		
Weighted Average			**161**	**54.3**	**147**	**41.8**	**-12.4**

MAT7 Results

4. **How successful were Sylvan staff in meeting the target of at least 55 instructional hours for the students served by the date on which students began MAT7 testing, March 23, 1998?**

Table 20 presents the number and percents of students attending Sylvan Learning Centers by grade. The number of students attending the Sylvan Centers range from 11 (0.5%) for grade 1 to 798 (34.4%) for grade 3, with a total of 2,329 students serviced. Of the 2,319 students attending, the largest numbers are from grades 3 (798, 34.4%), followed by grade 4 (603, 26.0%), and grade 6 (21.3%).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 20

Number and Percents of Students Attending SLC by Grade to June 15, 1998

	Grade													
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number Attending Sylvan Center	11	26	18	798	603	175	493	61	27	48	22	23	14	**2319**
Percent	**0.5**	**1.1**	**0.8**	**34.4**	**26.0**	**7.5**	**21.3**	**2.6**	**1.2**	**2.1**	**0.9**	**1.0**	**0.6**	**100.0**

Tables 21, 22, 23 and 24 reflect the numbers and percents of students who attended the Sylvan Centers for 55+ hours of instruction and who achieved gains of 3+ NCE units. The tables are presented by grade, by grade by school, and by school. The data in the tables reflect hours of instruction through June 15, 1998, because data from Sylvan did not clearly specify hours of instruction by the date of the administration of the MAT7, March 23, 1998.

Table 21

Number of Students Attending Sylvan Learning Center With 55+ Hours of Instruction by Grade by School to June 15, 1998

School	Grade													Group Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Brewer				23	44	21								88
Burbank							4							4
Burroughs							73		1					74
Campbell				60	26	11								97
Cooper				13	34									47
Douglass								2	11	11	2	2	2	30
Goodale				6										6
MAAT				57	25									82
Priest				14	46	34								94
Stark				8	10									18
Group Total				**181**	**185**	**66**	**77**	**2**	**12**	**11**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**540**

As reflected in Table 21, Campbell has the largest number of students (97) attending Sylvan Centers 55+ hours, followed by Priest (94), Brewer (88), MAAT (82), and Burroughs (74). Burbank has the smallest number of students attending the center (4), followed by Goodale (6). The numbers of students from Cooper, Douglass, and Stark who received 55+ instructional hours were 47, 30, and 18 respectively.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 22

Number of Students Attending Sylvan Learning Center With 3+ NCE Gains and 55+ Hours of Instruction by Grade by School to June 15, 1998

School	Grade													Group Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Brewer				7	12	3								22
Burbank							2							2
Burroughs							7							7
Campbell				33	3	5								41
Cooper				7	2									9
Douglass										3				3
Goodale				2										2
MAAT				25	11									36
Priest				6	10	10								26
Stark					1									1
Group Total				**80**	**39**	**18**	**9**			**3**				**149**

Table 22 presents the number of students who achieved gains of 3+ NCE units and 55+ instructional hours. Campbell had the largest number (41) of students who met both targets, followed by MAAT (36), Priest (26), and Brewer (22). Stark had the smallest number (1).

5. Did the students who participated in the Sylvan program achieve NCE gains of at least 3 units on the MAT7?

Table 23 presents the number and percents of students who received Sylvan services, the number of students with 55+ hours of instruction, and the percents of students with 55+ hours of instruction by school to June 15, 1998. The percents ranged from 1.1% (Burbank) with the lowest percent to the highest 56.0% (Priest). Campbell had 50% of its students with 55+ hours of instruction, followed by Brewer (42.3%), Burroughs (38.9%), MAAT (29.0%), Douglass (20.4%), Cooper (16.1), Stark (8.5), and Goodale (2.2%). Based on the total percent (23.3%) of students with 55+ hours of Sylvan instruction the Sylvan guarantee of at least 55 instructional hours for the students served by the date on which students began MAT7 testing, March 23, 1998, was not met.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 23

Number and Percents of Sylvan Students Who received 55+ Hours of Instruction to June 15, 1998 by School

School	Number of Students Who Receive Sylvan Services	Number of Students With 55+ Hours of Instruction	Percent of SLC Students With 55+ Hours
Brewer	208	88	42.3
Burbank	351	4	1.1
Burroughs	190	74	38.9
Campbell	198	97	50.0
Cooper	292	47	16.1
Douglass	147	30	20.4
Goodale	270	6	2.2
MAAT	283	82	29.0
Priest	168	94	56.0
Stark	212	18	8.5
Total	**2319**	**540**	**23.3**

Table 24
Number and Percents of Sylvan Students With Gain of 3+And 55+ Hours of Instruction to June 15, 1998

School	Number of Students With 55+ Hours of Instruction	Percent of all SLC Students with 3+ NCE's	Number of Students With Gains of 3+NCE's and 55+ Hours of Instruction	Percent of SLC with 55+ Hours with 3+ NCE's
Brewer	47	22.6	22	46.8
Burbank	77	21.9	2	2.6
Burroughs	20	10.5	7	35.0
Campbell	72	36.4	41	56.9
Cooper	67	22.9	9	13.4
Douglass	17	11.6	3	17.6
Goodale	110	40.7	6	54.5
MAAT	83	29.3	82	98.8
Priest	44	26.2	26	59.1
Stark	37	17.5	1	2.7
Total	**574**	**24.8**	**149**	**26.0**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 24 includes the numbers and percents of students with gains of 3+NCE units plus numbers and percents of students with both 3+NCE gains and 55+ hours of instruction for each school. The percent of students with 55+ hours of instruction and 3+ NCE gains is 26.0%. Based on the total percent (26.0%) of students with both 55+ hours of Sylvan instruction and gains of 3+ NCE units, and as 90% of the students were expected to make the 3+ NCE gains on the MAT7, the target was not met.

Table 25
Sylvan Students with 3+ NCE Gains
and 55+ Hours of Instruction
to June 15, 1998

School	MAT7 Read Comprehension Gain of 3+NCE's	MAT7 Read Vocabulary Gain of 3+ NCE's	MAT7 Reading Total Gain of 3+ NCE's
Brewer	22	23	**22**
Burbank	2	2	**2**
Burroughs	6	16	**7**
Campbell	54	31	**41**
Cooper	13	5	**9**
Douglass	4	5	**3**
Goodale	2	3	**2**
MAAT	32	45	**36**
Priest	32	27	**26**
Stark		5	**1**
Total	**167**	**163**	**149**

Table 25 presents data relative to the number of students who received 55 or more hours of instruction and who achieved 3+ NCE gains on each subtest of MAT7 Reading. As indicated, it is possible for students to gain 3+ NCE units on one subtest (comprehension) but not on the other one (vocabulary) as shown at Campbell which has 54 and 31 students respectively attaining 3+ NCE's on the two subtests and 41 students attaining 3 NCE's on total reading.

6. Did students who participated in the SLC achieve higher gains in MAT7 Reading scores compared with other students who did not participate?

Findings are not available at present.

7. What were principals' attitudes toward the SLC?

Principal Interviews

Principals of schools housing Sylvan Learning Centers were asked to participate in an interview regarding the program. All ten principals participated in the interviews. Each principal was asked to respond to a series of fourteen

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

questions regarding the centers. The results are outlined below.

How did you first learn about the Sylvan Learning Program?

Of the ten principals interviewed, six indicated that they first heard of the program at a presentation at the Area office. Of this number, six were able to visit Sylvan programs already in operation in Chicago. All of those who visited the Chicago site indicated that they were most impressed with the services being provided by the Sylvan staff and felt that their students could benefit from such a program.

How many students in your building participate in the Sylvan Learning Center?

When asked how many of their students participate in the center, MAAT indicated that 175 students participated in the program; Burbank, Stark, Priest, Cooper, Goodale, Burroughs, and Brewer indicated that 150 students were selected; while Campbell and Douglass indicated 133 and 100 respectively.

How were students selected to participate in the center?

When asked to describe their student selection process for the Sylvan center, eight out of ten principals referenced MEAP as the criterion for selection. Fourth grade students targeted to participate in the 1998 administration of MEAP and third graders who are expected to take the 1999 test were selected to participate in the program.

How effective did you expect Sylvan to be in improving student learning?

Principals were asked to respond to the effectiveness of Sylvan in improving student learning. One stated that Sylvan's initial promises were a little unrealistic, but felt optimistic about the level of help that they could promise, based on classroom structure. He also felt that they could replicate their success under similar conditions. One indicated that he was very impressed with the program offered in Chicago, particularly the program at Kabrini Green. One principal stated that she expected one year's growth, while one indicated that she did not expect a whole lot the first year. One stated that she expected them to live up to the guarantee of the contract. One principal felt the labs would be successful; one felt the labs would be very successful, while one expected the labs to be eighty percent effective. One principal did not respond, and one indicated that he expected more resistance from staff.

How often did you interact with the Sylvan staff?

When asked how often they interacted with the Sylvan staff, formally, three interacted monthly; one interacted bi-weekly; three interacted once a week; one interacted three to four times a week; and two interacted daily. Informally, one interacted two to three times a week, one three to four times a week; four interacted daily and two almost daily. One principal indicated that he received a monthly progress report while one received a weekly progress report.

Were any special provisions made for teachers to interact with the Sylvan staff?

When asked if special provisions were made for teachers to interact with the

Sylvan staff, one principal out of ten indicated that the regular education teachers were scheduled common preparation times with the Sylvan staff. One indicated that monthly meetings were facilitated by Sylvan; one indicated bi-monthly meetings were scheduled; and four indicated that no special provisions were made as Sylvan maintained an "open door" policy for teachers to come in and observe. In addition, five principals interviewed indicated that they receive written reports from the Sylvan staff on at least a monthly basis. Two principals reported that they would like to receive reports on a more consistent basis.

What kind of feedback from teachers/parents have you received regarding the Sylvan Learning Center?

Principals were asked to describe the feedback they have received from teachers regarding the program. Seven out of ten principals indicated that the feedback received from their teachers was positive. The three that received negative teacher feedback attributed it to a resistance to change on the part of teachers, animosity and/or resentment regarding students' desire to attend the Sylvan center and initial reluctance due to Sylvan's use of non-contract teachers.

When asked to describe the feedback received from parents regarding the Sylvan program, all ten principals reported positive feedback on the part of parents. At least eight out of ten reported receiving parental requests for services.

What issues or concerns were considered when making the final decision to fund the Sylvan Learning Center originally?

Two of our ten principals were concerned about the budget to accommodate the lab and how budget cuts would be made to afford the SLC. One indicated concern with the amount of money being committed to the program, and nervousness about results, also concern that there would not be money for other activities. One principal was concerned that what they were originally doing for school improvement did not work; he was also concerned with parents' requests for kids who could not read. One indicated that after school tutoring was eliminated and substituted with the Sylvan lab; another one indicated that he wanted to keep regular program services (social worker, Title I teachers, psychologist) intact. One was concerned with housing accommodations and continuity across the curriculum between teachers, lab, and language arts curriculum, while one indicated concern about the use of qualified teachers. One principal indicated not applicable.

Who was involved in the decision making process? Who made the decision to purchase?

One out of ten principals indicated that the administrator was involved in the decision making process. Eight indicated the principal along with teachers, staff, parents, and school community agent; two of these eight indicated Local School Community Organization and one indicated Area administrators. One principal indicated not applicable.

When asked who made the final decision to purchase the Sylvan centers, nine out of ten principals indicated it was a joint decision between the staff, parents, and the administrator.

If you had a choice, would you continue the Sylvan program in the 1998-99 school year?

To this question, all ten principals responded, "Yes."

How often did you receive student progress reports from the Sylvan staff?

In response to the number of progress reports that the principals received from the Sylvan staff, four out of ten indicated on a monthly basis; two indicated regularly; one indicated weekly, and one indicated on a semester basis. One indicated "None for administrator," while one indicated "No."

Did this meet your expectations and why?

Seven principals said, "Yes." The reasons offered follow:
"Yes, would like information regarding percentage of students that meet or gain improvement on a weekly basis, also would like information regarding warning signs of students who are not responding to program."

"Reports are aligned to the district's report."

"Yes, because the Sylvan staff was effective and organized. Further, they related well to students, parents, and staff and seemed to genuinely care about our students."

One principal said, "No," while one indicated not applicable.

Were the reports helpful? In what way?

To these questions, one principal said, "Absolutely, provided feedback on children." Seven indicated, "Yes, for assessing the effectiveness of program and correlating with the district to ensure maximum value." Another reason was "High time on task at all times in lab. Especially like the banking part of the program." Two provided no answer to the questions.

Did Sylvan facilitate workshop sessions for teachers? Parents? Did you attend?

For teachers, nine principals indicated that Sylvan did facilitate workshops, and six noted that Sylvan facilitated workshops for parents. One responded, "Sylvan gave an overview, strong parent component, no official workshop this year. Sylvan hosted teacher lunch and contractual breakfast." Four principals attended the workshops; one did not attend, while five did not respond.

How would you rate the reaction of the following to having the SLC in your school?

Teacher's reaction: On a scale of one to ten with ten as the highest, three principals indicated ten; three indicated nine; one indicated eight, seven, and six respectively. One did not respond. The mean rating was 8.7.

Parent's reaction: Eight principals indicated ten; one indicated nine; and one indicated eight. The mean rating was 9.7.

Student's reaction: Eight principals indicated ten; one indicated nine; and one indicated eight. The mean rating was 9.7.

On a scale of one to ten with ten as the highest, in your opinion, did the SLC fulfill its contractual obligation regarding:

Number of students served? Seven principals indicted ten; one indicated nine; and one indicated five. The mean rating was 9.3.

Service to students? Seven principals indicated ten; two indicated nine; and one indicated eight. The mean rating was 9.6.

Helping students learn? Seven principals indicated ten, while three indicated nine. The mean rating was 9.7.

Quality of service provided? Nine principals indicated ten and one indicated nine. The mean rating was 9.9.

Helping your school improve its MEAP scores? Three principals indicated ten; two indicated nine; two indicated seven; and one indicated five. Two did not respond. The mean rating was 8.4.

Helping your school improve its MAT scores? One principal indicated nine; two indicated eight; and one indicated seven. Six did not respond. The mean rating was 8.0.

Was finding space for the SLC an issue at your school? Why? Why not?

Eight out of ten principals said that finding space for the SLC was not a problem. Two indicated yes, with one offering the following explanation: "Yes, caused some bad feelings among staff, overcrowded for some time. Took the art room and made the art teachers mobile. Two classrooms were later converted to solve this problem. MEAP scores went down significantly. Believe it is due to the loss of two fourth grade teachers and high-class size.

Teacher Surveys

Teachers of schools housing Sylvan centers were asked to respond to a survey regarding their perceptions and attitudes about the Sylvan Learning Centers. From the ten schools surveyed, seven returned 106 completed teacher survey forms. Of this number, the school making the largest contribution was Burroughs Middle School (28.3%). A breakdown of the number and percentage of responses received by school is listed below in Table 26.

Table 26
Number and Percent of Teachers Responding to Survey by School

School	Number of Teachers Responding	Percent of the Total
Brewer	18	17.0
Burbank	9	8.5
Burroughs	30	28.3
Campbell	14	13.2
Cooper	10	9.4
Douglass	4	3.8
Goodale	11	10.4
Priest	10	9.4
Total	**106**	**100.0**

Grade Level and Subject Area Taught

As shown in Tables 27 and 28 teachers responding to the survey were asked to identify the primary grade for which they are responsible. Of the total number of teachers responding to this question, the largest percent identified grade 4 (20.8%) followed by grade 3 (17.9%). When asked to identify the subject area taught, the area selected by more teachers than any other was homeroom (34.0%) followed by language arts (28.3%).

Table 27
Number and Percent of Teachers by Grade Levels

Grade Level	Number	Percent
1	13	12.3
2	10	9.4
3	19	17.9
4	22	20.8
5	14	13.2
6	18	17.0
7	16	15.1
8	15	14.2
9	1	0.9
10	3	2.8
11	2	1.9
12	2	1.9
Kindergarten	4	3.8
Other	6	5.7
No Answer	1	0.9
Total	**146**	**137.8**

Note: Figures add to more than 100% because of multiple answers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 28
Number and Percent of Teachers by Subject Area

Category	Number	Percent
Counselor	2	1.9
Homeroom	36	34.0
Language Arts	30	28.3
Mathematics	8	7.5
Physical Ed.	3	2.8
Science	3	2.8
Self Contained	2	1.9
Social Studies	7	6.6
Special Ed.	2	1.9
Other	11	10.4
No Answer	2	1.9
Total	**106**	**100**

Percentage of Students Attending the Sylvan Center

Tables 29 and 30 reflect data relative to student attendance in the Sylvan Learning Center. Teachers were asked to identify the percentage of their students who attended the center. Of the total number of responses received, the largest percentage indicated none (31.1%) followed by more than 50% (24.5%). When asked to select from a list of categories how often their students attended the lab, the category selected most often was "frequently" (2 times a week or more) (52.8%).

Table 29
Percent of Students Participating in the Sylvan Learning Center

Category	Number	Percent
None	33	31.1
01 - 10	13	12.3
11 - 20	14	13.2
21 – 30	5	4.7
31 – 40	4	3.8
41 - 50	4	3.8
More than 50%	26	24.5
No Answer	7	6.6
Total	**106**	**100**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 30

Average Attendance of Students Participating in the Sylvan Learning Center

Category	Number	Percent
Frequently	56	52.8
Often	8	7.5
Somewhat Often	2	1.9
Rarely	0	0.0
Never	26	24.5
No Answer	14	13.2
Total	**106**	**100**

Classroom Continuity

When asked how much their students' participation in the Sylvan center affected the continuity of their classroom, 32.1% selected the category "a great deal," as indicated in Table 31.

Table 31

The Effect of participation in SLC on the Continuity of Classroom Instruction

Category	Number	Percent
A Great Deal	34	32.1
A Little	21	19.8
Not at All	29	27.4
No Answer	22	20.8
Total	**106**	**100**

How Effective was Sylvan?

Teachers were asked to select from the categories excellent, good, fair and poor, the one that best describes how effective they believe Sylvan was in improving the reading vocabulary and comprehension of their students. Of the total number responding, the category selected by more teachers than any other for both reading vocabulary and comprehension was "good" (26.4% and 25.5% respectively). Table 32 presents data relative to the effectiveness of Sylvan.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 32
The Effectiveness of Sylvan
in Improving Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary

Category	Number and Percent			
	Vocabulary		Comprehension	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Excellent	13	12.3	12	11.3
Good	28	26.4	27	25.5
Fair	19	17.9	21	19.8
Poor	5	4.7	4	3.8
Did Not Receive	20	18.9	21	19.8
No Answer	21	19.8	21	19.8
Total	**106**	**100**	**106**	**100**

As indicated in Table 33, when asked if they would agree to the school continuing the funding for the Sylvan center, 78.3% of the responding teachers indicated "yes."

Table 33
Number and Percent of Teachers for Continuation of the
Sylvan Learning Center Funding

Category	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	40	37.7
Agree	43	40.6
Disagree	6	5.7
Strongly Disagree	5	4.7
No Answer	12	11.3
Total	**106**	**100**

Interaction with Sylvan Staff

Teachers were asked to select from a list of categories the one that most accurately describes their level of interaction with the Sylvan instructional staff. The list included frequently (2 times a week or more), often (at least once a week), never as presented in Table 34. The categories selected by more teachers than any other were "frequently" and "never" (21.7% each). In addition, when asked how often they received student progress reports from the Sylvan staff (written or verbal), the category most often selected was "never" (28.3%).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 34
Teacher Interaction with Sylvan Staff

Category	Number and Percent			
	Interaction with SLC Staff		SLC Progress Reports	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Frequently	23	21.7	8	7.5
Often	17	16.0	11	10.4
Somewhat Often	20	18.9	19	17.9
Rarely	8	7.5	18	17.0
Never	23	21.7	30	28.3
No Answer	15	14.2	20	18.9
Total	**106**	**100**	**106**	**100**

Teacher In-service Training

When asked to respond to the question "**Did you participate in the workshop training facilitated by the Sylvan staff at your school?**" Forty-five percent of the teachers surveyed indicated "yes." Those who indicated that they did not participate were asked to select from a list of categories the one that most accurately describes "why not." The category most often was "none scheduled" (12.3%). The data are presented in Tables 35 and 36.

Table 35

Teacher Participation in In-service Training

Category	Number	Percent
Yes	48	45.3
No	44	41.5
No Answer	14	13.2
Total	**106**	**100**

Table 36

Reasons for Non Participation in In-service Training

Category	Number	Percent
I did not feel they (in-service) related to me.	9	8.5
I was not invited to participate.	4	3.8
I did not know about them (in-service).	12	11.3
I was not available to attend.	11	10.4
There were none (in-services) scheduled	13	12.3
No Answer	57	53.8
Total	**106**	**100**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Level of Involvement in Decision to Purchase

Tables 34 and 37 present data relative to the level of teacher involvement in the decision to purchase Sylvan. When asked if they were involved in the decision process to purchase the Sylvan Learning Center at their respective buildings, 54.7% of the responding teachers indicated that they were not involved at all. However, 61.3% of the responding teachers indicated that they did agree with the decision to the purchase. When asked if their school should continue the funding for Sylvan Learning Centers, 40.6% agreed, while 37.7% strongly agreed.

Table 37
Level of Teacher Involvement in the Decision Process to Purchase Sylvan

Category	Number	Percent
Very Much Involved	16	15.1
Somewhat Involved	23	21.7
Not Involved at All	58	54.7
No Answer	9	8.5
Total	**106**	**100**

Table 38
Teacher Agreement of the Decision to Purchase Sylvan

Category	Number	Percent
Yes	65	61.3
No	22	20.8
No Answer	19	17.9
Total	**106**	**100**

Teacher Comments Regarding the Program

There were 38 comments made by responding teachers regarding the program. Of this number, 75% were positive and 16.7% were negative. The remainder, 8.8%, was neutral. The vast majority of the comments made addressed the positive effect Sylvan had on increased student learning. (See appendix)

Parent Phone Interviews

Parents/guardians of the Sylvan participants were interviewed by telephone regarding their feelings and perceptions of the Sylvan Learning Centers. Of the 1,062 calls attempted to the parents/guardians of students who are receiving services from the centers, 301 responded to the survey. This number represents a 28.3% response rate. Table 39 contains the number of completed interviews for all participating schools. The largest percent of responses came from parents/guardians of students who attend Burbank Middle School.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 39
Number and Percent of Parents
Responding to Phone Interview by School

School	Number	Percent
Brewer	120	11.3
Burbank	123	11.6
Burroughs	147	13.8
Campbell	112	10.5
Cooper	86	8.1
Douglass	64	6.0
Goodale	86	8.1
MAAT Imhotep	96	9.0
Priest Elementary	121	11.4
Stark School of Technology	107	10.1
Total	**1062**	**100**

As noted in Table 40, dialing results indicated that 256 telephones were "disconnected;" 198 had "no answer"; 143 had "wrong number"; 98 reported that the "parent/guardian was unavailable"; and 42 requested a "call back later."

Table 40
Dialing Results

Category	Number	Percent
No Answer	198	26.0
Busy Signal	16	2.1
Phone Disconnected	256	33.6
Parent/Guardian Unavailable	98	13.0
Refused to Respond	2	0.3
Call Back Later	42	5.5
Wrong Number	143	19.0
Parent/Guardian Non-English Speaking	6	0.8
Total	**761**	**100**

Awareness of the Program

Parents/guardians of Sylvan Learning Center students were asked if they were aware of their child's participation in the program. Of the total number responding to the survey, 242 (80.4%) indicated that they were aware of their child's participation in the program, while 59 (19.6%) indicated that they were not aware of their child's participation in the program (N=301). Table 41 outlines the results.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 41

Parent Awareness of the Sylvan Program

Category	Number	Percent
Yes	242	80.4
No	59	19.6
Total	**301**	**100.0**

Parent Workshops

Parents/guardians of Sylvan Learning Center students were asked if they participated in the workshops facilitated by Sylvan staff. Of those responding to the survey, 72 (29.6%) answered "yes." Note Table 42.

Table 42
Parent Workshops

Category	Number	Percent
Yes	72	29.6
No	171	70.4
Total	**243**	**100**

The parents who attended the workshops were asked to rate the effectiveness of the workshops using an excellence rating scale. More than three fourths, (79.4%) rated the workshop "excellent" (N=73). The results are presented in Table 43.

Table 43
Effectiveness of Parent Workshop

Category	Number	Percent
Excellent	58	79.4
Good	14	19.2
Fair	1	1.4
Poor	0	0.0
Total	**73**	**100**

Parents who indicated that they did not attend the workshops were asked "why not." More than half, (62%) indicated that they (parents) were "not available"(N=103). More than one third of the parents (37.3%) did not know about the workshops, as shown in Table 44.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 44
Reasons Parents Did Not Attend Workshop

Category	Number	Percent
Did not know about it	62	37.3
Was not invited to participate	0	0.0
Was not available	103	62.0
Did not feel it related to me	1	0.6
Total	**166**	**99.9**

Parents Interaction with Sylvan Staff

Parents were asked if they had any other contact with the Sylvan staff. In response to the question, 62% (N=148) indicated that they did as presented in Table 45.

Table 45
Parents Interaction with Sylvan Staff

Category	Number	Percent
Yes	148	62.2
No	90	37.8
Total	**238**	**100**

Table 46 presents data relative to the level of participation of parents. When asked to describe the level of participation, "parent-teacher meeting" was the answer given most often (55%, N=91).

Table 46
Level of Parent Participation

Category	Number	Percent
Parent-Teacher Conference	91	54.8
In-home Meeting	1	0.6
Telephone	44	26.5
Letter	30	18.1
Total	**166**	**100**

Student Progress Reports
When asked to indicate how often they received student progress reports from the Sylvan staff, the response offered most often was "regularly" (36.0%, N=86).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 47
Student Progress Reports

Category	Number	Percent
Regularly	31	36.0
Somewhat Often	14	16.3
Seldom	21	24.4
None	20	23.3
Total	**86**	**100.0**

Continuation of Services

When asked if they would like for their child to continue their participation in the program, 99.6% indicated that they would. Table 48 presents the data for continuation of services. When asked to indicate "why" the vast majority (93.7%) offered a variety of reasons that covered improvement in both cognitive and affective domains. (See appendix.)

Table 48
Continuation of Sylvan Services

Category	Number	Percent
Yes	235	99.6
No	1	0.4
Total	**236**	**100**

Concerns Regarding the Program

Parents were asked to describe any problems or concerns that they had with the program. Eleven parents expressed concerns regarding the program. Of this number, seven were regarding the receipt of progress reports and other information regarding the program. Three of the concerns were in regards to receiving information about workshops and/or meetings and one indicated concern for the lack of parent contact. See appendix.

Conclusions

Each of the ten principals interviewed indicated that if given the choice, they would continue the Learning Center in their respective buildings.

Teachers' reactions to the program were mixed.

Parents liked the program.

Students received considerably less than the contracted number of hours of service.

Twenty-four of the 1431 students (1.7-%) received 55 or more hours of instruction before the MEAP test was administered.

Four of the seven SLC elementary schools had an increase of a minimum

of five-percentage points in the number of students in the "Satisfactory" category of the Grade 4 MEAP reading when 1996-97 scores are compared to 1997-98 scores.

None of the three SLC middle schools had an increase of a minimum of five-percentage points in the number of students in the "Satisfactory" category of the Grade 7 MEAP reading when 1996-97 scores are compared to 1997-98 scores.

There is no significant difference in the Grade 4 MEAP reading scores between the SLC schools and a control group of schools.

There is no significant difference in the Grade 7 MEAP reading scores between the SLC schools and a control group of schools.

Five hundred and forty of the 2,319 students (23.3%) received 55 or more hours of instruction before the MAT7 test was administered.

One hundred forty-nine students out of 2,319 achieved a gain of 3 NCE units on the MAT7 test.

At present, findings are not available to determine if there is a significant difference in MAT7 reading scores between the SLC schools and a control group of schools.

Contracted costs for each hour of student contact time is $20.83. The actual cost per student per hour of instruction was higher than the contracted hourly rate of $20.83. The number of hours contracted was 116,456 but the number of hours received was 83,638; therefore, contracted hours were more than hours received. When calculated, the actual cost of each hour is $29.11, a difference of $8.28 more per hour than the contracted amount.

Recommendations

As a result of the positive feedback received from school principals, teachers, and parents, it is recommended the Sylvan Learning Centers be continued in the 10 schools that have currently contracted for services by Sylvan. However, in light of Sylvan's failure to meet the contractual obligation in regards to hours of service and the MEAP guarantee, we strongly recommend that any future agreements with Sylvan be evaluated by an ad hoc committee. This committee should include principals, members of the research and evaluation team and a representative from the legal department. Issues to be considered by this committee include the following:

Hours contracted for service: Sylvan did not meet the contractual obligation in this area at any of the 10 schools currently being served. This would indicate that, most likely, too many hours were purchased at the outset. In an effort to better gauge how many hours are actually needed and can realistically be used, it is recommended that schools reduce the number of hours initially purchased. A clause should be added to the contract that would allow schools to purchase additional hours if needed at a comparable rate of pay.

Guarantees:

MEAP: To insure that the contractor is held to the terms of the contract in regards to the guarantees for

improvements in the schools' overall MEAP scores, student selection should focus on those students who will be administered the MEAP test.

MAT: Relative to students in grades 1-10 the focus should be on those students who are in greatest need of preparation prior to the administration of the MAT. Inasmuch as the MAT7 guarantee that 90% of the students who receive 55 hours of instruction will achieve a gain of three NCE units was not met, maintain the guarantee that students will gain three NCE units but revisit the guarantee of 90%. Continue to push for improvement in students in SLC and work with Sylvan staff to insure that time spent in SLC is productive.

In addition, students should be allowed to attend the center for a sufficient amount of time to insure that they meet the 55-hour requirement before both the MEAP and MAT assessments are administered. Middle and high school administrators may want to consider developing student schedules that make the Sylvan center a regularly scheduled class, as opposed to pulling students from regular teachers.

Teacher In-service Training: To insure that a collaborative relationship is nurtured between the Sylvan staff and the regular teachers, all administrators should work with Sylvan staff to insure that in-service training is indeed scheduled and that all teachers are aware of them.

Parent Involvement/Cooperation: To foster parent involvement, participation, and cooperation and develop a collaborative relationship with parents, Sylvan administrators, teachers, and staff should work with parents to insure that parents are made to feel welcome in the schools. Parents also need to feel that their input is of great value to the success of the program and to the academic achievement of their children.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MEAP DATA

Case Summaries

Grade			Area	School Code	School Name	MEMBERSHIP	T1POVERTY
4	Control	1	E	376	White	1256	77
		2	F	056	Carstens	797	74
		3	F	063	Clark	1079	63
		4	E	165	Holmes AL	848	81
		5	F	333	Stellwage	834	65
		6	F	055	Carleton	973	44
		7	A	270	Neinas	533	81
		Total Mean				902.86	69.29
	Sylvan	1	F	331	Stark	776	85
		2	A	296	Priest	1017	72
		3	E	071	Cooper	821	85
		4	F	136	Goodale	1164	82
		5	F	769	Brewer	934	74
		6	A	078	Campbell	499	79
		7	F	309	MAAT	1149	64
		Total Mean				908.57	77.29
	Total	Mean				905.71	73.29
7	Control	1	E	414	Cleveland	1108	80
		2	A	465	McMillan	353	80
		3	F	438	Foch	818	59
		Total Mean				759.67	73.00
	Sylvan	1	E	406	Burroughs	678	82
		2	A	617	Douglass	328	62
		3	F	405	Burbank	767	55
		Total Mean				591.00	66.33
	Total	Mean				675.33	69.67
Total	Mean					836.60	72.20

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Case Summaries

Grade				Area	School Code	School Name	96MEAPRN	96MEAPRSAT	96MEAPRLOW
4	Control	1		E	376	White	157	12	61
		2		F	056	Carstens	98	14	54
		3		F	063	Clark	145	21	41
		4		E	165	Holmes AL	86	22	45
		5		F	333	Stellwage	136	43	28
		6		F	055	Carleton	157	51	20
		7		A	270	Neinas	47	53	36
		Total	Mean				118.00	30.86	40.71
	Sylvan	1		F	331	Stark	115	16	51
		2		A	296	Priest	131	17	50
		3		E	071	Cooper	83	18	37
		4		F	136	Goodale	175	22	42
		5		F	769	Brewer	110	47	26
		6		A	078	Campbell	54	50	17
		7		F	309	MAAT	136	67	8
		Total	Mean				114.86	33.86	33.00
	Total	Mean					116.43	32.36	36.86
7	CODE Control	1		E	414	Cleveland	275	18	56
		2		A	465	McMillan	19	21	42
		3		F	438	Foch	189	24	52
		Total	Mean				161.00	21.00	50.00
	Sylvan	1		E	406	Burroughs	170	11	58
		2		A	617	Douglas	10	20	50
		3		F	405	Burbank	187	25	31
		Total	Mean				122.33	18.67	46.33
	Total	Mean					141.67	19.83	48.17
Total	Mean						124.00	28.60	40.25

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Case Summaries

Grade			Area	School Code	School Name	98MEAPRN	98MEAPRSAT	98MEAPRLOW
4	Control	1	E	376	White	164	18	59
		2	F	056	Carstens	76	12	62
		3	F	063	Clark	126	23	47
		4	E	165	Holmes AL	88	44	27
		5	F	333	Stellwage	102	50	26
		6	F	055	Carleton	168	44	26
		7	A	270	Neinas	75	63	28
		Total Mean				114.14	36.29	39.29
	Sylvan	1	F	331	Stark	97	30	45
		2	A	296	Priest	120	13	61
		3	E	071	Cooper	85	26	44
		4	F	136	Goodale	120	65	13
		5	F	769	Brewer	123	33	37
		6	A	078	Campbell	52	33	31
		7	F	309	MAAT	119	77	2
		Total Mean				102.29	39.57	33.29
	Total Mean					108.21	37.93	36.29
7	CODE Control	1	E	414	Cleveland	227	15	32
		2	A	465	McMillan	20	35	50
		3	F	438	Foch	193	9	52
		Total Mean				146.67	19.67	44.67
	Sylvan	1	E	406	Burroughs	264	14	50
		2	A	617	Douglas	25	0	76
		3	F	405	Burbank	204	12	57
		Total Mean				164.33	8.67	61.00
	Total Mean					155.50	14.17	52.83
Total Mean						122.40	30.80	41.25

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade 4 Group Statistics

Variable	CODE	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MEMBERSHIP	Control	7	902.86	229.64	86.80
	Sylvan	7	908.57	233.97	88.43
T1POVERTY	Control	7	69.29	13.25	5.01
	Sylvan	7	77.29	7.74	2.93
96MEAPRN	Control	7	118.00	41.95	15.86
	Sylvan	7	114.86	38.87	14.69
96MEAPRSAT	Control	7	30.86	17.60	6.65
	Sylvan	7	33.86	20.52	7.76
96MEAPRLOW	Control	7	40.71	14.26	5.39
	Sylvan	7	33.00	16.53	6.25
98MEAPRN	Control	7	114.14	39.46	14.92
	Sylvan	7	102.29	26.43	9.99
98MEAPRSAT	Control	7	36.29	18.80	7.11
	Sylvan	7	39.57	22.79	8.61
98MEAPRLOW	Control	7	39.29	16.31	6.16
	Sylvan	7	33.29	20.12	7.61

Grade 4 Independent Samples Test

Variable	Assumptions	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
									Lower	Upper
MEMBERSHIP	Equal variances assumed	.015	.905	-.046	12	.964	-5.71	123.91	-275.69	264.26
	Equal variances not assumed			-.046	11.996	.964	-5.71	123.91	-275.70	264.27
T1POVERTY	Equal variances assumed	1.659	.222	-1.379	12	.193	-8.00	5.80	-20.64	4.64
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.379	9.667	.199	-8.00	5.80	-20.98	4.98
96MEAPRN	Equal variances assumed	.400	.539	.145	12	.887	3.14	21.62	-43.96	50.24
	Equal variances not assumed			.145	11.931	.887	3.14	21.62	-43.99	50.27
96MEAPRSAT	Equal variances assumed	.471	.506	-.294	12	.774	-3.00	10.22	-25.26	19.26
	Equal variances not assumed			-.294	11.728	.774	-3.00	10.22	-25.32	19.32
96MEAPRLOW	Equal variances assumed	.468	.507	.935	12	.368	7.71	8.25	-10.26	25.69
	Equal variances not assumed			.935	11.746	.369	7.71	8.25	-10.31	25.74
98MEAPRN	Equal variances assumed	2.179	.166	.660	12	.521	11.86	17.95	-27.26	50.97
	Equal variances not assumed			.660	10.481	.523	11.86	17.95	-27.90	51.61
98MEAPRSAT	Equal variances assumed	.140	.714	-.294	12	.774	-3.29	11.17	-27.62	21.04
	Equal variances not assumed			-.294	11.583	.774	-3.29	11.17	-27.71	21.14
98MEAPRLOW	Equal variances assumed	.051	.825	.613	12	.551	6.00	9.79	-15.33	27.33
	Equal variances not assumed			.613	11.506	.552	6.00	9.79	-15.43	27.43

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade 7 Group Statistics

Variable	CODE	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MEMBERSHIP	Control	3	759.67	380.87	219.89
	Sylvan	3	591.00	232.07	133.99
T1POVERTY	Control	3	73.00	12.12	7.00
	Sylvan	3	66.33	14.01	8.09
96MEAPRN	Control	3	161.00	130.28	75.22
	Sylvan	3	122.33	97.65	56.38
96MEAPRSAT	Control	3	21.00	3.00	1.73
	Sylvan	3	18.67	7.09	4.10
96MEAPRLOW	Control	3	50.00	7.21	4.16
	Sylvan	3	46.33	13.87	8.01
98MEAPRN	Control	3	146.67	111.01	64.09
	Sylvan	3	164.33	124.34	71.79
98MEAPRSAT	Control	3	19.67	13.61	7.86
	Sylvan	3	8.67	7.57	4.37
98MEAPRLOW	Control	3	44.67	11.02	6.36
	Sylvan	3	61.00	13.45	7.77

Grade 7 Independent Samples Test

Variable	Assumptions	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig	T	df	Sig (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
									Lower	Upper
MEMBERSHIP	Equal variances assumed	.647	.466	.655	4	.548	168.67	257.50	-546.26	883.60
	Equal variances not assumed			.655	3.305	.555	168.67	257.50	-609.62	946.95
T1POVERTY	Equal variances assumed	.076	.797	.623	4	.567	6.67	10.70	-23.04	36.37
	Equal variances not assumed			.623	3.919	.568	6.67	10.70	-23.28	36.61
96MEAPRN	Equal variances assumed	.252	.642	.411	4	.702	38.67	94.00	-222.32	299.65
	Equal variances not assumed			.411	3.708	.703	38.67	94.00	-230.62	307.96
96MEAPRSAT	Equal variances assumed	2.052	.225	.525	4	.628	2.33	4.45	-10.01	14.68
	Equal variances not assumed			.525	2.693	.640	2.33	4.45	-12.78	17.44
96MEAPRLOW	Equal variances assumed	1.596	.275	.406	4	.705	3.67	9.02	-21.39	28.72
	Equal variances not assumed			.406	3.008	.712	3.67	9.02	-25.01	32.35
98MEAPRN	Equal variances assumed	.052	.831	-.184	4	.863	-17.67	96.23	-284.85	249.52
	Equal variances not assumed			-.184	3.950	.863	-17.67	96.23	-286.20	250.87
98MEAPRSAT	Equal variances assumed	1.653	.268	1.223	4	.288	11.00	8.99	-13.97	35.97
	Equal variances not assumed			1.223	3.129	.305	11.00	8.99	-16.96	38.96
98MEAPRLOW	Equal variances assumed	.160	.710	-1.627	4	.179	-16.33	10.04	-44.21	11.54
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.627	3.850	.182	-16.33	10.04	-44.64	11.97

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

MAT DATA

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Sylvan Learning Center Code * End of Year w/55+ hours	540	23.3%	1779	76.7%	2319	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center Code * MAT7 Reading Comprehension Gain of 3+ NCEs	623	26.9%	1696	73.1%	2319	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center Code * MAT7 Reading Vocabulary Gain of 3+ NCEs	640	27.6%	1679	72.4%	2319	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center Code * MAT7 Reading Total Gain of 3+ NCEs	574	24.8%	1745	75.2%	2319	100.0%

Sylvan Learning Center Code * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

		End of Year w/55+ hours	
		1.00	Total
Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer	88	88
	Burbank	4	4
	Goodale	6	6
	MAAT Imhotep	82	82
	Stark	18	18
	Campbell	97	97
	Douglass	30	30
	Priest	94	94
	Burroughs	74	74
	Cooper	47	47
Total		540	540

Sylvan Learning Center Code * MAT7 Reading Comprehension Gain of 3+ NCEs Crosstabulation

Count

		MAT7 Reading Comprehension Gain of 3+ NCEs	
		1.00	Total
Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer	49	49
	Burbank	97	97
	Goodale	96	96
	MAAT Imhotep	80	80
	Stark	46	46
	Campbell	83	83
	Douglass	22	22
	Priest	49	49
	Burroughs	20	20
	Cooper	81	81
Total		623	623

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sylvan Learning Center Code * MAT7 Reading Vocabulary Gain of 3+ NCEs Crosstabulation

Count

		MAT7 Reading Vocabulary Gain of 3+ NCEs	
		1.00	Total
Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer	49	49
	Burbank	91	91
	Goodale	135	135
	MAAT Imhotep	91	91
	Stark	46	46
	Campbell	62	62
	Douglass	17	17
	Priest	45	45
	Burroughs	40	40
	Cooper	64	64
Total		640	640

Sylvan Learning Center Code * MAT7 Reading Total Gain of 3+ NCEs Crosstabulation

Count

		MAT7 Reading Total Gain of 3+ NCEs	
		1.00	Total
Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer	47	47
	Burbank	77	77
	Goodale	110	110
	MAAT Imhotep	83	83
	Stark	37	37
	Campbell	72	72
	Douglass	17	17
	Priest	44	44
	Burroughs	20	20
	Cooper	67	67
Total		574	574

Crosstabs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Sylvan Learning Center Code * MAT7 Reading Comprehension Gain of 3+ NCEs * End of Year w/55+ hours	167	7.2%	2152	92.8%	2319	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center Code * MAT7 Reading Vocabulary Gain of 3+ NCEs * End of Year w/55+ hours	163	7.0%	2156	93.0%	2319	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center Code * MAT7 Reading Total Gain of 3+ NCEs * End of Year w/55+ hours	149	6.4%	2170	93.6%	2319	100.0%

Sylvan Learning Center Code * MAT7 Reading Comprehension Gain of 3+ NCEs * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

			MAT7 Reading Comprehension Gain of 3+ NCEs	
End of Year w/55+ hours			1.00	Total
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer	22	22
		Burbank	2	2
		Goodale	2	2
		MAAT Imhotep	32	32
		Campbell	54	54
		Douglass	4	4
		Priest	32	32
		Burroughs	6	6
		Cooper	13	13
	Total		167	167

Sylvan Learning Center Code * MAT7 Reading Vocabulary Gain of 3+ NCEs * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

			MAT7 Reading Vocabulary Gain of 3+ NCEs	
End of Year w/55+ hours			1.00	Total
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer	23	23
		Burbank	2	2
		Goodale	3	3
		MAAT Imhotep	45	45
		Stark	5	5
		Campbell	31	31
		Douglass	6	6
		Priest	27	27
		Burroughs	16	16
		Cooper	5	5
	Total		163	163

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sylvan Learning Center Code * MAT7 Reading Total Gain of 3+ NCEs * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

End of Year w/55+ hours			MAT7 Reading Total Gain of 3+ NCEs 1.00	Total
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer	22	22
		Burbank	2	2
		Goodale	2	2
		MAAT Imhotep	36	36
		Stark	1	1
		Campbell	41	41
		Douglass	3	3
		Priest	26	26
		Burroughs	7	7
		Cooper	9	9
	Total		149	149

Crosstabs

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Sylvan Learning Center Code * SLCGRADE * End of Year w/55+ hours	540	23.3%	1779	76.7%	2319	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center Code * SLCGENDER * End of Year w/55+ hours	540	23.3%	1779	76.7%	2319	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center Code * Native Language Code * End of Year w/55+ hours	363	15.7%	1956	84.3%	2319	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center Code * Ethnic Code * End of Year w/55+ hours	506	21.8%	1813	78.2%	2319	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center Code * Special Ed Code * End of Year w/55+ hours	20	.9%	2299	99.1%	2319	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center Code * Vocational Code * End of Year w/55+ hours	1	.0%	2318	100.0%	2319	100.0%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sylvan Learning Center Code * SLCGRADE * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

End of Year w/55+ hours			SLCGRADE				
			3	4	5	6	7
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer	23	44	21		
		Burbank				4	
		Goodale	6				
		MAAT Imhotep	57	25			
		Stark	8	10			
		Campbell	60	26	11		
		Douglass					2
		Priest	14	46	34		
		Burroughs				73	
		Cooper	13	34			
	Total		181	185	66	77	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sylvan Learning Center Code * SLCGRADE * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

End of Year w/55+ hours			SLCGRADE			
			8	9	10	11
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer				
		Burbank				
		Goodale				
		MAAT Imhotep				
		Stark				
		Campbell				
		Douglass	11	11	2	2
		Priest				
		Burroughs	1			
		Cooper				
	Total		12	11	2	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sylvan Learning Center Code * SLCGRADE * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

End of Year w/55+ hours			SLCGRAD 12	Total
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer		88
		Burbank		4
		Goodale		6
		MAAT Imhotep		82
		Stark		18
		Campbell		97
		Douglass	2	30
		Priest		94
		Burroughs		74
		Cooper		47
	Total		2	540

Sylvan Learning Center Code * SLCGENDER * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

End of Year w/55+ hours			SLCGENDER F	SLCGENDER M	Total
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer	35	53	88
		Burbank	1	3	4
		Goodale	2	4	6
		MAAT Imhotep	47	35	82
		Stark	5	13	18
		Campbell	52	45	97
		Douglass		30	30
		Priest	46	48	94
		Burroughs	35	39	74
		Cooper	18	29	47
	Total		241	299	540

Sylvan Learning Center Code * Native Language Code * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

End of Year w/55+ hours			Native Language Code 00	01	02	03	16
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer	41				
		Burbank	2				
		Goodale					
		MAAT Imhotep	63			1	
		Stark	12				
		Campbell	34				
		Douglass	22				
		Priest	47	6	1	1	1
		Burroughs	44			1	
		Cooper	19		1	6	
	Total		284	6	2	9	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sylvan Learning Center Code * Native Language Code * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

End of Year w/55+ hours			Native Language Code				Total
			17	50	69	82	
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer		7		1	49
		Burbank					2
		Goodale		5			5
		MAAT Imhotep		14			78
		Stark		2			14
		Campbell		8			42
		Douglass		1			23
		Priest	1	10	1		68
		Burroughs		9			54
		Cooper		2			28
	Total		1	58	1	1	363

Sylvan Learning Center Code * Ethnic Code * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

End of Year w/55+ hours			Ethnic Code			
			1	2	3	4
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer		1	87	
		Burbank			2	
		Goodale			6	
		MAAT Imhotep			81	
		Stark			17	
		Campbell			93	
		Douglass			24	
		Priest	1	1	47	13
		Burroughs		2	64	
		Cooper	1		40	
	Total		2	4	461	13

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sylvan Learning Center Code * Ethnic Code * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

End of Year w/55+ hours			Ethnic Code	Total
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer		88
		Burbank		2
		Goodale		6
		MAAT Imhotep		81
		Stark		17
		Campbell		93
		Douglass		24
		Priest	22	84
		Burroughs	2	68
		Cooper	2	43
	Total		26	506

Sylvan Learning Center Code * Special Ed Code * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

End of Year w/55+ hours			Special Ed Code				
			00	33	34	52	53
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer				1	1
		Burbank					
		MAAT Imhotep			1		1
		Campbell	1		1		1
		Douglass	1				
		Burroughs	2				1
		Cooper		1	1		2
	Total		4	1	3	1	6

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sylvan Learning Center Code * Special Ed Code * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

End of Year w/55+ hours			Special Ed Code 54	Special Ed Code 55	Total
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Brewer	1		3
		Burbank	1		1
		MAAT Imhotep			2
		Campbell			3
		Douglass		1	2
		Burroughs	2		5
		Cooper			4
	Total		4	1	20

Sylvan Learning Center Code * Vocational Code * End of Year w/55+ hours Crosstabulation

Count

End of Year w/55+ hours			Vocational Code 19	Total
1.00	Sylvan Learning Center Code	Douglass	1	1
	Total		1	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
ADMINISTRATORS (PRINCIPALS)

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
ADMINISTRATORS

School _____

Administrator _____

1. How did you first learn about the Sylvan Learning Program? _____

2. How many students in your building participate in the Learning Center? _____

3. How were students selected to participate in the Center? Describe the selection process.

4. How effective did you expect Sylvan to be in improving student learning? _____

5. How often did you interact with the Sylvan staff? Describe. _____

6. Were any special provisions made for teachers to interact with the Sylvan staff? _____

7. What kind of feedback from teachers have you received regarding the Sylvan Learning Center?

8. What kind of feedback have you received from parents regarding the Sylvan Learning Center?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9a. What issues or concerns were considered when making the final decision to fund the Sylvan Learning Center originally?

_____

_____

_____

9b. Who was involved in the decision making process? _____

_____

_____

9c. If you had a choice, would you continue the program in the 1998-99 school year?

❑ Yes ❑ No

10a. How often did you receive student progress reports from the Sylvan staff? _____

_____

_____

_____

10b. Did this meet your expectations and why? _____

_____

_____

_____

10c. Were the reports helpful? In what way? _____

_____

_____

_____

11a. Did Sylvan facilitate workshop sessions for teachers? Parents? Did you attend? _____

_____

_____

_____

	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 (high)
11b. How would you rate the teachers reaction to having the SLC in your school?	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
11c. parents' reaction	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
11d. students' reaction	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
12. In your opinion, did the SLC fulfill its contractual oligation regarding:	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
a. number of students served	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
b. service to students	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
c. helping students learn	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
d. quality of service provided	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 (high)
e. helping your school improve its MEAP scores	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
f. helping your school improve its MAT scores	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

13. Was finding space for the SLC an issue at your school? Why/Why not?

❑ Yes ❑ No

APPENDIX D

SYLVAN LEARNING CENTER TEACHER SURVEY

SYLVAN LEARNING CENTER
TEACHER SURVEY

School Name _____

Please respond to the following questions regarding your school's participation in the Sylvan Learning Center. Your candid opinions regarding the program will assist the district in future planning. Please return all completed surveys to Karen Lee in the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment in the Marie Farrell Donaldson Building by May 29, 1998. Surveys may also be faxed at 494-2669.

1. Please identify the grade level that you teach. Darken all that apply.

❑ kdg. ❑ 1 ❑ 2 ❑ 3 ❑ 4 ❑ 5 ❑ 6 ❑ 7 ❑ 8 ❑ 9 ❑ 10 ❑ 11 ❑ 12 ❑ other

2. Select the one subject area for which you are primarily responsible.

❑ Homeroom ❑ Language Arts ❑ Other: _____
❑ Mathematics ❑ Science
❑ Physical Education ❑ Social Studies

3a. What percentage of your students participate in the Sylvan Learning Center?

❑ None ❑ 1 to 10 ❑ 11 to 20 ❑ 21 to 30 ❑ 31 to 40 ❑ 41 to 50 ❑ More than 50%

3b. On average, how often did your students attend the center?

❑ Frequently (2 times a week or more)
❑ Often (at least once a week)
❑ Somewhat Often (at least twice a month)
❑ Rarely (Maybe once a month)
❑ Never

3c. How much did your students' participation in the Sylvan Learning Center affect the continuity of instruction in your classroom?

❑ A great deal ❑ A little ❑ Not at all

4. Thinking back to the start of the school year, how effective did you think Sylvan would be in improving student learning?

❑ Excellent ❑ Good ❑ Fair ❑ Poor ❑ Did not receive

5. How effective <u>was</u> Sylvan in improving the reading vocabulary of your students?

❑ Excellent ❑ Good ❑ Fair ❑ Poor ❑ Did not receive

6. How effective <u>was</u> Sylvan in improving the reading comprehension levels of your students?

❑ Excellent ❑ Good ❑ Fair ❑ Poor ❑ Did not receive

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. Select the category that most accurately describes your level of interaction with the Sylvan instructional staff.

- ❑ Frequently (2 times a week or more)
- ❑ Often (at least once a week)
- ❑ Somewhat Often (at least twice a month)
- ❑ Rarely (Maybe once a month)
- ❑ Never

8. How often did you receive student progress reports from the Sylvan staff (written or verbal)?

- ❑ Frequently (2 times a week or more)
- ❑ Often (at least once a week)
- ❑ Somewhat Often (at least twice a month)
- ❑ Rarely (Maybe once a month)
- ❑ Never

9. If you did receive progress reports, select the category that most accurately describes how helpful they were in your efforts to improve student learning.

❑ Excellent ❑ Good ❑ Fair ❑ Poor ❑ Did not receive

10. Did you participate in the workshop trainings faciliated by the Sylvan staff at your school?

❑ Yes ❑ No

11. If you did not participate in the workshops facililated by Sylvan, select the reason that most accurately describes why not?

- ❑ Did not feel that they related to me
- ❑ Was not invited to participate
- ❑ Did not know about them
- ❑ I was not available to attend
- ❑ None scheduled

12. How involved were you in the decision process to purchase the Sylvan Learning Center?

❑ Very much involved ❑ Somewhat involved ❑ Not involved at all

13. Did you agree with the decision to purchase the Sylvan Learning Center? . . . . ❑ Yes ❑ No

14. Would you agree to the school continuing the funding for the Sylvan Learning Center?

❑ Strongly Agree ❑ Agree ❑ Disagree ❑ Strongly Disagree

Comments _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX E

SYLVAN LEARNING CENTERS
PARENT PHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

SYLVAN LEARNING CENTERS
Parent Phone Interview Questionnaire

School Name _____ Date _____ Time of Call _____

Student Name _____ I.D.# _____

Phone Number _____ Interviewer _____

Please read the following script upon receiving a response to the call:

Good Morning/Afternoon. I am (your name) from the Detroit Public Schools. May I please speak to the parent or guardian of (student name). We are currently conducting an evaluation of one of our school programs. We need about 4 minutes of your time to help us in evaluating the effectiveness of our Sylvan Learning Labs. Do you have a moment? If yes, continue to question #1. If no, ask if there is a better time in which we can call back.

Dialing Results

- ❑ No answer
- ❑ Busy signal
- ❑ Phone disconnected
- ❑ Parent or guardian unavailable.
- ❑ Refuse to respond
- ❑ Call back later
- ❑ Wrong Number

1. Are you aware of your child's participation in the Sylvan Learning Center?

❑ Yes ❑ No

2a. If yes to question #1, when did you first learn of the program? _____

2b. If no to question #1, thank the caller for their time and end the call. _____

3. Did you attend the parent workshop?

❑ Yes ❑ No

3a. If yes, how would you rate the effectiveness of the information presented?

❑ Excellent ❑ Good ❑ Fair ❑ Poor

4. If no to Question #3, why not?

- ❑ Did not know about it
- ❑ Was not invited to participate
- ❑ Was not available
- ❑ Did not feel it related to me

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. Have you had any contact with the Sylvan staff?

❑ Yes ❑ No

6. If yes to question #5, describe your level of participation. Check all that apply.

❑ Parent-Teacher Meeting ❑ In -home meeting ❑ Phone ❑ Letter

7. How often did you receive student progress reports from the Sylvan staff? _____

_____

8. Would you like for your child to continue his/her participation in the Sylvan Learning Centers?

❑ Yes ❑ No

8a. Why or why not? _____

_____

_____

9. Please identify any problems or concerns you have with your child's participation in the Sylvan Learning Center.

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE